DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 318 063 CS 507 134

AUTHOR Skow, Lisa; And Others
TITLE World View: The Second Hidden Dimension.
PUB DATE Feb 90
NOTE 37p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Western Speech Communication Association (Sacramento, CA, February 16-20, 1990).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Abstract Reasoning; Communication Research; *Cross Cultural Studies; *Cultural Differences; *Decision Making; Foreign Countries; *Intercultural Communication; Non Western Civilization
IDENTIFIERS Negotiators; *World View

ABSTRACT

Proposing that world view is a dimension of culture which lies below the surface of human behavior at the level of the subconscious, this paper argues that this often ignored dimension of culture profoundly influences human communication. The paper is divided into two sections. First, world view is defined and its importance in explaining how communication operates is described from multiple perspectives. Second, as a way of demonstrating the specific influence of world view, the paper shows how it helps clarify the negotiation styles employed by various cultures. The paper then focuses on linking world view with how cultures make decisions, choose negotiators, and use abstract or concrete reasoning. Thirty references are attached. (Author/SR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED318063

World View: The Second Hidden Dimension

Lisa Skow, Larry A. Samovar and Susan A. Hellweg

Department of Speech Communication

San Diego State University

Intercultural Communication Interest Group

Western Speech Communication Association Conference

Sacramento, CA

February 1990

CS507134

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

SUSAN HELLWEG

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Abstract

Edward T. Hall described time and space as hidden cultural variables that affect communication. Another dimension of culture, world view, lies even further below the surface of human behavior at the level of the subconscious. This paper proposes that it is this often ignored, second hidden dimension of culture that most profoundly influences human communication. The paper is divided into two sections. First, world view is defined and its importance in explaining how communication operates is described from multiple perspectives. Second, as a way of demonstrating the specific influence of world view we will try to show how it helps clarify the negotiation styles employed by various cultures. We will attempt to link world view with how cultures (1) make decisions, (2) choose negotiators, and (3) use abstract or concrete reasoning.

World View: The Second Hidden Dimension

> Culture hides much more than it reveals, and strangely enough what it hides, it hides most effectively from its own participants.
>
> (Hall, 1959, p. 30)

When we examine the field of intercultural communication we are, by chance or design, automatically thrust into the world of Western thought. "Western man," as Hall (1977) tells us, "sees his system of logic as synonymous with the truth. For him it is the only road to reality" (p. 9). While this condition would seem inconsistent and even repugnant to those who study intercultural communication, we believe that most scholars in the area do not seek diverse interpretations of reality. Whether empirical or speculative, studies in our field have overwhelmingly used Western methodologies in asking research questions and in answering those questions. Two of the most prevalent Western predispositions serve as the motivation behind this essay. First, it is the tendency of our research tradition to divide the human experience up into segments, and second, the Western bias towards consciousness as the primary way of "knowing." It is our opinion that these two penchants have kept us from examining the importance of <u>world view</u> on both culture and communication. Before we attempt to justify this assertion, let us briefly develop the two reproaches we lodged against the status quo.

Most of the study in intercultural communication has focused on the "scientific method" as it has evolved throughout Europe and the United States. It dictates an examination of most phenomena by breaking them apart and examining the separate variables. We have, of course, also done this with the study of culture. Hofstede's (1980) landmark study in values across cultures is a consummate example of this variable-comparative approach to intercultural communication research. While the variables isolated by Hofstede are useful (power distance, individualism, masculinity, and uncertainty), they are nevertheless excluding what we are calling the larger, and even more important force, that of world view. It is as if one looked at the spark plugs of a car and disregarded the fuel that ignites the plugs. Just as gasoline fires the spark plugs, world view motivates a culture.

Our second censure deals with the Western dichotomy toward the conscious and subconscious. It is not our intent to rebuff the value of studying communication at the conscious level, for such a criticism would be folly. In fact, it would be preposterous for us not to grant that much of our behavior stems from our consciousness. What we are averse to is the exclusion of the subconscious as yet another way of explaining communication. Even when the Western Journal of Speech Communication (Winter, 1986) devoted an entire issue to the topic of consciousness there was hardly a mention of the subconscious elements involved in communication. This same

faultfinding was articulated by Hall (1959) over 30 years ago when he wrote: "Honest and sincere men in the field continue to fail to grasp the true significance of the fact that culture controls behavior in deep and persisting ways, many of which are outside of awareness and therefore beyond conscious control of the individual" (p. 25). Hall referred to these neglected and out-of-awareness aspects as the hidden dimensions of culture and communication.

While Hall was talking about the nonverbal elements that were invisible, we are now about to take the position that a culture's world view, like its response to time and space, is also invisible, crucial, and overlooked as a possible explanation of human behavior. More specifically, we shall offer the proposition that world view might be both a catalyst and a shaper of other variables. It serves as a major cultural system that demonstrates how time, space, thought, perception, and even talk are interrelated. As a way of developing this supposition the paper will be divided into two parts. We will begin by defining world view and offering a number of different ways people have attempted to explain why it needs to be considered if one is to explain how communication operates. Second, as a way of demonstrating the specific influence of world view we will try to show how it helps clarify the negotiation styles employed by various cultures. We will attempt to link world view with how cultures (1) make

decisions, (2) choose negotiators, and (3) use abstract or concrete reasoning.

The Concept of World View

The concept that there is a grand set of principles that govern each culture is not new with this essay. Scholars have for a great many years attempted to trace the impact of world view on human behavior. For example, environmentalists have been suggesting that the Bible, specifically, God's injunction to man in Genesis to "subdue the earth," has contributed to an attitude among American's that the earth belongs to them, and that they have the "right" to use the environment as they wish. The rationale is a simple one - God told them they are "Masters" of fish, sea, and earth. Hence, unlike Shintoism, which has an aesthetic appreciation of nature, Americans use their world view not to be in harmony with nature, but rather as a justification for controlling nature.

The notion that there is a comprehensive structure within each culture that is used to command much of life is often difficult to envision - let alone explain. By its very nature the subconscious defies overt expression. Yet world view, while abstract, does supply a universal order and explanation. We begin to get a feel for the importance of world view when we look at how it is defined. It is "the outlook or image we have concerning the nature of the universe, the nature of humankind, the relationship between humanity and the universe, and other philosophical issues or orientations that help us define the

cosmos and our place in it" (Samovar, Porter, & Jain, 1977, p. 90). This definition hints at the significance of world view by pointing us towards issues such as religion, death, suffering, nature and the universe, and other questions of "being." For example, the Islamic view of heaven as a place of great joy and happiness, combined with their view of martyrdom, can help explain why people who hold this world view are so willing to die - as was the case in the bombing of the Marine facility in Lebanon. Another example took place during World War II. The Buddhist's belief in reincarnation is a very different view that conceives of death as an absolute. Americans' inability to understand this orientation kept them from understanding the suicide bombings employed by Japanese pilots. As Fisher (1983) explained, "Japanese culture and expectations did supply a value and attitude pattern to support the kind of sacrifices involved, and this had to be understood to make sense out of Japanese behavior" (p. 15).

Unlike the more obvious and measurable cultural variables such as space, values, eye contact, touching behavior, and the like, world view does not show itself directly. What one gets when looking for world view is both the voice and the echo - and of course it is almost impossible to say which is the sound and which is the reply. Put yet another way, we can all ask questions about life and death, suffering, and the universe, but world view translates the answers to these questions into behavior. Hence, we begin by granting that world view, like

Hall's other dimensions, is obscure and distinct, implicit and explicit, hidden and conspicuous. But even though they are shadowed by what often appears to be metaphysical gobbledygook, "World issues are timeless and represent the most fundamental basis of a culture" (Porter & Samovar, 1988, p. 26). As Pennington (1985) wrote when referring to world view:

> This component has to be given high, if not first, priority in the study of a culture. Because this component permeates all others, its significance cannot be underestimated. If one understands a culture's world view and cosmology, reasonable accuracy can be attained in predicting behaviors and motivations in other dimensions. (p. 31)

This, of course, is what we shall try to do later in the paper when we connect world view to negotiation styles.

As we noted with our environment example, we are not the first group of people who have attempted to describe the influence of world view on human behavior. The ancient Greek's arche referred to those underlying principles that directed human thought and action. Socrates' "examined life" espoused universal definitions reached through scientific methods that culminated in the "just man living justly." "In the 'examined life' we are seeking to find the perfect form or pattern of the life that is supremely worth while" (Bakewell, 1949, p. 80). A culture's world view is believed by its members to be that perfect pattern of the universe. It is a set of culturally and

ethnocentrically defined parameters within which the environment can be defined and have meaning. These definitions of life and death form the deep structure of all cultures, and as one would suspect, take a variety of forms. For example, the Hindu conceptualization of world view is found in the Brahman, which for the Hindu is the supreme reality. Like Socrates' universal truths, the Brahman may be thought of as "a philosophical Absolute" (Jain, 1982). "According to Hinduism, the Brahman is in a sense the very world itself, including both living and nonliving aspects of the universe" (Jain, 1982, p. 115). For the Hindu it becomes the blueprint for human behavior. For the followers of the Islamic faith the Koran becomes the blueprint.

Scholars have also visualized world views as "truth continua" with grid-like patterns of how the world is ordered. Northrop's (1946) theoretic and aesthetic continua deal with Western and Eastern ways of understanding and perceiving the world. A world view as conceptualized by Northrop's "theoretic continuum" is a model of the world based on the acquiring of knowledge through "concepts by postulation." That is, the world is made sense of through inferences, speculations, and suppositions rather than through actual experiences in the environment. The theoretic component "directs attention away from the aesthetically immediate, to the inferred component of things" (Northrop, 1946, p. 163). The theoretic continuum used by Western cultures is not one based on experience that is

immediately comprehensible, but on observation that has been guided by hypotheses and a structured system of compartmentalized steps. "It is not necessary for the Western reader to squat upon his haunches, like a sage in an Indian forest, immediately apprehending and contemplating what is designated" (Northrop, 1946, p. 316). The Westerner need only read his or her great books of knowledge or hear someone else talk about "life" to find processual order. For Westerners to experience nature would be to risk the hallowed goal of objectivity; they must remain separate from and untouched by nature. As we shall see later, this separation touches much of how Westerners live their lives and make decisions.

The aesthetic continuum in the Northrop model is "a single-all embracing continuity" (Northrop, 1946, p. 333) and refers to experienced sense data that may not be explained or measured through scientific manipulation. Howell (1982) calls the intuitive nature of this truth continuum as "belly talk." He illustrates how this aspect of world view is reflected in communication behavior of the Japanese:

> A Japanese manager who is confronted with a perplexing problem studies it thoroughly; once he feels he understands what the problem is, he does <u>not</u> attempt to collect data and develop hypotheses. He waits. He knows that his "center of wisdom" is in his lower abdomen, behind and somewhat below the navel. In due time a

> message will come from the center, giving him the answer he desires. (p. 223)

The intuitive nature of this aspect of Eastern world view is difficult to translate into Western terms. For us any knowledge that comes from "feelings" or "hunches" is not to be trusted. We even cast a negative hue over this form of knowing by using expressions such as "it is just female intuition." Hence, Eastern and Western notions of truth move by different methods and often reach different conclusions.

Our next perspective of world view attempts to explain it as an "existential, ontological hierarchy" (Pennington, 1985, pp. 31-32). While the categories of investigation might be different in Pennington's classification, the rationale for studying world view is consistent with the other approaches. She tells us the "Probing cosmological issues allow one to penetrate deeper, to really begin to understand the nature of culture" (Pennington, 1985, p. 31). This understanding is fostered by our knowing such things as a culture's view of "(1) Supreme Being, (2) supernatural beings, (3) humans, (4) lower forms of life, (5) inanimate objects, and (6) nature" (Pennington, 1985, pp. 31-32).

Another way to conceptualize the notion of world view is in Adler's (1976) "psychophilosophical" patterning of cultural identity. "All cultures, in one manner or another, invoke the great philosophical questions of life: the origin and destiny of existence, the nature of knowledge, the meaning of reality,

the significance of the human experience" (Adler, 1976, p. 367). Adler explains that just as individuals have an identity so, too, do cultures, and each identity may be thought of as a unique way of making sense of and categorizing the world. Categorization is an integral element of every culture's world view. Sense cannot be made out of chaos for chaos offers no answers for human beings who desire to know why and how the world is the way it is. Stewart (1972) claims that the various ways in which cultures categorize the world may also be thought of as sets of "reality categories," a system for ascribing sense to surrounding stimuli to formulate a culturally unique picture of truth and reality.

While the ways of looking at world view have offered diverse classifications, they have all agreed on a number of points that we shall touch upon as we conclude the initial portion of the paper. First, regardless of the categories employed, scholars agree that world view is concerned with the large questions people face as they attempt to make sense out of life. Such questions deal with life, death, suffering, reality, the cosmos, and how each individual fits into a grand scheme. Second, there is also agreement that it is easier to talk about world view than to point to it. That is to say, we can talk about the Maasai story of creation, but it is difficult to explain how that folklore is manifested in behavior. Third, even though the link between world view and communication is a difficult one to make, most writers in the

area believe that to understand any culture we must try to understand that link. It is that very challenge that serves as the motivation behind the next section of the paper. As we indicated earlier, we shall try to demonstrate how a culture's world view might influence the manner in which that culture negotiates.

World View and Intercultural Negotiations

As we have already indicated, the subject of world view appears to be a subject only philosophers and religious leaders are able to define. To ask most people, regardless of their culture, to describe how their belief in an after-life governs their daily behavior would be a fruitless endeavor, for as noted earlier, the residue of world view is hidden. But it is a delusion to accept the idea that this residue cannot be discovered or that it is not crucial. As Glenn (1954) pointed out, "It is a mistake to believe that philosophical differences of opinion exist only at the level of conscious and deliberate controversies waged by professional philosophers. Ideas originated by philosophers permeate entire cultural groups; they are in fact what distinguishes one cultural group from another" (p. 163).

Because world view is a "philosophical idea" that does permeate an entire culture, we shall try to isolate its influence on but one aspect of a culture's communication behavior: the manner in which a culture takes part in international negotiations. The assumption, at least in

stating is simple - the ways in which a culture makes decisions, chooses the members of a negotiation team, and uses abstract or concrete reasoning are directly linked to that culture's world view.

Decision Making

Making decisions is the essence of negotiations. In an international negotiation setting, both sides must first reach a decision intraculturally among its own members and then interculturally between the two teams. The Japanese have a very communal decision making process and as a result may take longer to make a decision. Anyone affected by the decision must have a role in the decision-making process (even shareholders of a company); thus the Japanese negotiating team is not the decisive representative of the larger corporation or government (Greenwald, 1983). Decision-by-consensus is the typical procedure for Japanese negotiators (Weiss & Stripp, 1985). The group process is emphasized with both adoption and preparation for implementation of policies carried out simultaneously (Fisher, 1980). Americans like to proceed in a systematic, time-efficient decision-making mode during negotiations. This leads to a highly rationalistic style of negotiation (Weiss & Stripp, 1985). Who makes the decisions on the opposing team is crucial to American negotiators (Fisher, 1980), a preoccupation that clashes with the lengthy Japanese consensus style of reaching a decision. Described by Graham and Herberger (1983) as "John Wayne" negotiators, Americans

think they can go it alone, and handle any negotiation situation that may arise.

The American preference for rational decision making and the individualistic vs. consensus styles of reaching a decision can be examined from a world view perspective. American patterns of thinking are overtly operationalized: "It is the operational quality of American thinking that makes it unusual, the incessant need to systematize the perception of the world into a form that enables the individual to act" (Stewart, 1972, p. 23). Stewart describes the rational decision-making strategy of Americans as highly comparative:

> The American resists describing or judging something in terms of itself or in its own context. Instead, he insists on a comparison. He evaluates himself against others like himself; he judges a movie against other movies he has seen; he judges his children against the norm for their age; and then, most naturally, he judges other people against Americans. (1972, p. 29)

Thus the rational mode of categorization as used by Americans is based largely on the comparative quality of objects instead of on individual, unique, and self-defining characteristics.

Rationality in decision making is further described by Van Nieuwenhuijze (1963) as an "active divide" whose "basic function is to cut reality in parts, to segregate distinct entities, or rather, to make entities appear as distinct by abstractingly sundering reality, by isolating sovereign

entities from one another" (p. 164). Any decision-making process that can be identified by and divided into separate parts or steps is a rational, systematic approach called "analytic." The "holistic" method of information processing often attributed to Asian cultures is quite different. It is not an easily divisible system since data are processed simultaneously and out of awareness (Howell, 1982). Gulick (1962) describes this disparity between the Occidental rational mode of thinking and the Oriental intuitive approach: "The one develops and disciplines man's emotional nature, his sense of propriety, his aesthetic tastes; the other develops and disciplines the reason and will, the capacity to think and act independently. The one begets a culture of courtesy, the other a culture of realism" (p. 68). Hall (1984) refers to this Eastern-Western dichotomy as substance vs. process philosophies: "the contrasting commitment to substance and process forms of metaphysics are functions of differential emphases upon alternate cultural interests" (p. 24).

Decision making also differs when we compare American negotiators' majority-rule and issue-oriented style of decision making to that of the Japanese consensus style. Argumentation is not the best way to reach a consensus; harmony among group members is the best approach. "Making a decision is analogous to resolving a conflict, and the ideas of conflict and confrontation are serious breaches of the Japanese values of harmony and interdependence" (Okabe, 1983, p. 33). The

Japanese emphasis put on the entire group as a decision-making entity is reflected in the Buddhist dual tradition of viewing life with both a sense of wholeness and separateness simultaneously. Although all members will contribute as individuals to the decision at hand, the group will never for a moment lose its sense of entitativity.

Northrop (1946) describes this Japanese fusion of separateness and wholeness with his differentiated and undifferentiated aesthetic continua, a theory of Eastern world view that simultaneously considers both particular and generalizable qualities in all living things. Aristotelian philosophy also expressed this duality of separateness and group membership but these writings, unlike those of Buddhism, never came to terms with this apparent discrepancy (Oliver, 1962). A basic tenet of ancient Greek and American democracy is the informed individual making individual decisions apart from the group as a whole. Buddhism, however, has reconciled this contradiction between "entire realness and unique particularity by positing a monistic rather than a pluralistic universe" (Oliver, 1962, p. 145). Decisions made by Japanese negotiators must therefore be reached through consensus without the benefit of a strong central group leader so that self-interest and the unique particularity of the individual does not take over the entire realness -- the universal wholeness --

of the larger group being represented by the negotiating team.

> "The chief necessity, then, to enhance the effectiveness of our communication with the Buddhist third of the human race, is to understand that when they talk, or when they listen to us, they interpret any particular aspect of reality in terms of an indivisible whole" (Oliver, 1962, p. 149).

The communal and intuitive approaches to decision making used by Japanese negotiators may seem inefficient and inadequate to rational, time-conscious Americans. But such differences in decision making are not surprising given the diverse world views of each culture. One culture conceives of the world as a line on which a negotiator proceeds methodologically, step-by-step towards a decision. The other's world is more circular and no step of the decision- making process can be completely separated from another. It is a holistic rather than a compartmentalized view of the world, a view that ultimately impacts how decisions are made during international negotiations.

Selection of Negotiators

The impact of world view on intercultural negotiations may also be exemplified in the selection process used when choosing members for a negotiation team. Sex, status, rank, experience, knowledge, and age are all factors to varying degrees in this culture-specific process. While the leader of an American negotiation team may be the most experienced

member, a Japanese team may be headed by a less knowledgeable but higher ranking member. The American democratic ideal of "equality" and the Chinese and Japanese devotion to a status hierarchy may clash during a negotiation session.

The most vocal member of an American negotiation team is often the designated leader (Soderberg, 1985). Americans are more likely to send younger negotiators (early 30s and late 20s) and include women in the negotiation process (Greenwald, 1983). Technical expertise is also a major selection criterion for American negotiation teams. Social status, education, and age are inconsequential prerequisites and considered unreasonable selection criteria by American negotiators (Fisher, 1980). The Chinese and Japanese selection criteria for negotiation teams are almost the opposite of American requirements. The Chinese send high-status individuals and expect to deal with the same during negotiations (Scott, 1981). Japanese appoint team leaders not based on knowledge and technical expertise but more so on status, rank and age. In fact, the leader of a Japanese negotiation team may only be a spokesperson for the team while the other members act as technical experts (Fisher, 1980). Women are very rarely included and older team members (late 30s and 40s) are usually selected (Greenwald, 1983).

The importance of social status for Chinese negotiators may be understood using a world view perspective as illustrated in the traditional Chinese code of behavior found in the

Confucian concept of Li (Rules governing the way of life). Li set forth strict guidelines that highly valued rank and social position. "Superiority in society and status in the governing class was the important thing. A one-sided obedience of the lower class to members of the upper class was emphasized" (Nakamura, 1964, p. 265). Even some of the words and expressions in the Chinese language foster an adherence to a social hierarchy. Pronouns refer to a person's specific social class. In addition, according to their position in the family, siblings are referred to by different pronouns: hsiung (elder brother), ti (younger brother), tzu (elder sister), and mei (younger sister) (Nakamura, 1964).

"Honorifics" in language take on an even greater significance in the Japanese culture and act as a "ritual in conversation." "Special pronouns are required for superiors, equals, inferiors, intimates, and strangers. If one should confuse them, difficulties would ensue" (Nakamura, 1964, p. 409). As Nakamura further explains, the individual is not the unit of society but rather the group is, and the individual's position in the group dictates his or her behavior and level of respect accorded by other group members. Status directs the Japanese along a road of propriety during interaction. This emphasis on propriety in Japanese culture is linked historically to the Japanese assimilation of Chinese thought in the form of Confucianism and its code of conduct Li. The doctrines of Buddhism (particularly the basic tenet of human

equality), however, had to be modified to reflect the importance of social status in Japanese human relations. For example, certain concepts in Sanskrit Buddhism such as anukampa ("to tremble in sympathy with another person") were loosely translated into Japanese and reflected the Japanese language's inherent hierarchical structure. Thus anukampa became the Japanese awaremi which implies specifically pity or compassion given from a superior to an inferior. Nakamura explains that even Japanese mythology reflects this concern for social hierarchy in human relations. The popular Japanese myths Kojiki and Nihonshoki centered upon the Emperor and the Imperial family, and the prestige accorded them by the Japanese people. "We may suppose that Japanese myth is only a reflection of the social behavior of the ancient Japanese" (p. 427).

In examining the Chinese culture we can also see the relationship between world view and the selection of personnel for a negotiation team. In Chinese society, the individual is emphasized in relation to certain members in his/her life. It is through these roles in various relationships that Chinese individuals become members of society (Yu-Lan, 1949). Traditional Chinese society was organized by what were known as five social relationships ranked hierarchically in importance: sovereign/subject, father/son, husband/wife, elder/younger brother, and friend/friend. The nature of each

relationship was defined accordingly:

> Father and son should love each other. Sovereign and subject should be just to each other. Husband and wife should distinguish their respective spheres. Elder and younger brothers should have a sense of precedence. Between friends there should be good faith. (Yu-Lan, 1949. p. 25)

All relationships fit into one of these five categories, relationships defined by principles of behavior called the "common way of the world." There were different degrees of greater and lesser affections and responsibilities required of individuals in each of these relationships. The three most important of these relationships were called the Kang: sovereign/subject, father/son, and husband/wife.

Such a hierarchical view of human relationships is reflected in the team selection process used by Chinese negotiators. The Kang provided Chinese citizens with a code of behavior that designated certain relationships as deserving of more attention and respect. Similarly, individuals who have spent the most time with a company, are elder members, or who have acquired a certain high level of status are deserving of more respect and therefore will be most likely chosen as negotiators for Chinese teams. Thus individuals and relationships, including those in an official, business environment, are all accorded respect based on preestablished hierarchical levels of honor.

Use of Abstract and Concrete Reasoning

Intercultural negotiation sessions are also characterized by a variety of reasoning styles negotiators use and are willing to accept from opposing teams. And the type of reasoning used during negotiations can be explained according to culture-specific world views adopted by negotiators. Those negotiators from cultures that value abstract reasoning may misunderstand individuals from cultures who favor the use of more concrete, tangible ideas during negotiation. According to Graham and Herberger (1983), Americans tend to be more interested in making logical arguments than in the people they are dealing with. Similarly, the French enjoy debating during negotiations and welcome and respect dissent. They tend to be confrontational, competitive and view negotiation as a search for sound and reasonable arguments (Weiss & Stripp, 1985). For American negotiators, the persuasion phase of negotiations is the longest and perceived as the most important; less time is spent in the previous task-related stage where most information is given by Japanese negotiators (Graham & Sano, 1986). This American and French penchant for argumentation is characteristic of the more abstract thinking processes used by Western cultures. Debating issues and ideas using hypothetical examples is the typical mode of persuasion.

Conversely, Chinese and Japanese negotiators do not relish the argument like their Western counterparts. The typical Western proposal-counter-proposal method of negotiation

is shunned by both Japanese and Chinese negotiators (Weiss & Stripp, 1985). The reason for this disregard for Western-style negotiation tactics is due to their rejection of hypothetical examples (Fisher, 1980; Weiss & Stripp, 1985). The Japanese are persuaded with detailed information rather than persuasive arguments (Weiss & Stripp, 1985). They seek and use simple symbolic expression during interaction (Morrison, 1972). Both the Japanese and the Chinese can be described as "situation negotiators." Western negotiators may resent the Japanese practice of taking different positions in different situations (Fisher, 1980). Stewart (1976) describes the Chinese style of reasoning as also situation-governed:

> The Chinese mind is concrete and he is situation-centered to a degree unbelievable to the Westerner. He does not derive laws and principles that presumably govern events in the way that the Westerner does. In the writings of Mao Tse-tung we read that the laws of war are different according to the character of the war, its time, its place, and the nation. (p. 323)

Abstract, universal principles do not govern Japanese and Chinese negotiations or thought processes. It is their highly contextual and concrete mode of reasoning that so clearly distinguishes Oriental thought from the abstract, logical thinking of Occidentals. The following paragraphs illustrate this distinction using world view perspectives that characterize Eastern and Western modes of reasoning. First,

the impact of Buddhist world view on the concrete and contextual reasoning styles of the Japanese and the Chinese cultures is presented. Then the highly abstract Aristotelian, syllogistic reasoning style used by Americans is examined. The Eastern "here-and-now" approach to negotiations differs sharply from the futuristic perspective taken by American negotiators.

Concrete Reasoning. The tendency of Zen Buddhism "to express abstract philosophical ideas in concrete images" is what Nakamura (1964) most attributes to influencing the Chinese ways of thinking concretely. For example, the Buddhist phrase shan, ho, ta-ti ("mountains, rivers, and the great earth") refers to the single, more abstract term "universe." The human ego expressed as ts'ao-yuan i-ti-shui means literally "a drop of water in the source." And the human body known in Buddhist terms as ch'ou-p'i-tai means "stinking bag of bones" (p. 180). All of these phrases use concrete, metaphorical images to teach Buddhist philosophy. The Indian phrases that permeated Indian Buddhism were not adequate for the Chinese translators wishing to introduce the tenets of Buddhism to China. Like English, the Indian language did not accommodate the more concrete, aesthetic nature of Chinese characters. For example, the Indian word for "monastery" is sangha or gana, which mean "group or conglomeration." But the Chinese Zen Buddhist translators used the Chinese term ts'ung-lin, which was "to suggest that the harmonious life of a monastic community is similar to a thicket where trees and grasses grow together"

(Nakamura, 1964, p. 180). Abstractions such as "group" did not describe adequately the true nature of a monastery. As Nakamura states, "Nearly all words express particular ideas -- forms of existing things perceived in a particular state. They aim at expressing things by individualization and specification rather than by analysis" (p. 178).

The tendency to use concrete images to explain complex concepts is also characteristic of the Japanese. Just in the Japanese haiku we see simple images of nature stated briefly that often express complex ideas about the world and "consequently the emotional mood which is conveyed by each single word has greater importance" (Nakamura, 1964, p. 552). A concrete, specific object such as a tree may be used to describe something much deeper such as knowledge or truth. Nakamura explains that, "Japanese thought did not shape itself in the form of intellectual and systematic theories; rather it was apt to be expressed in the intuitive and emotional style of the arts" (p. 553). When translated by Japanese Buddhists, Indian Buddhism adopted a different characteristic and interpretation in accordance with the more concrete, aesthetic nature of the Japanese language. As a result, the Japanese used "particular illustrations in order to express the universal, abstract ideas and general propositions of [Indian] Buddhism" (Nakamura, 1064, p. 555). The following Japanese translations of Indian Buddhist doctrines make the point clear:

	Indian Buddhism Phrases	Japanese Buddhism Translation
1.	The Precept that Thou Shalt Not Commit Adultery	You must content yourselves with enjoying the beautiful sight of a mountain spring. Do not go beyond that. Do not scoop and soil water, even if it is overflowing.
2.	The Identity of Mind and the Buddha	I am floating and sinking among the waves indistinguishable from the mandarin duck or the sea gull.
3.	Whatever is phenomenal is impermanent; their essential quality is appearance and disappearance; when these repose, tranquility is comfort.	Although fragrant in hue, (blossoms) are scattered. For everyone, life is impermanent. This morning I crossed the outermost limit, and I am not intoxicated.

(Nakamura, 1964, pp. 555-556)

The Indian phrases are highly abstract and there is no use of particular examples to explain their meaning; "It is philosophy disguised in verse-form" (Nakamura, 1964, p. 556). In contrast, the Japanese translations use vivid and familiar imagery to explain elaborate concepts. Although highly

metaphorical, Japanese Buddhist writings with its abundance of easily perceived images from nature, reflect the highly concrete process of thought characteristic of Japanese ways of thinking.

Contextual Reasoning. Context and "the situation" are important concepts in Chinese and Japanese thought. The world is largely perceived according to the conditions governing the present, not those that might characterize the future. "They [Asian cultures] take it for granted that what is said today is meant in terms of today's conditions and may have to be re-interpreted tomorrow" (Oliver, 1962, p. 142). The Japanese see things more subjectively, more contextually. Universal principles are less important and preceded by relationships. "Criteria, in other words, may be more situational than absolutistic" (Okabe, 1983, p. 28). Intuition is extremely dependent on the situation whereas logic as exemplified in the Aristotelian syllogism works according to strict rules of rational, processual methodology.

Chinese Buddhism did not use consistent, universal propositions in order to express the truth: "The later Zen masters did not seek to give explanations in rational terms, they sought rather to give them in a figurative and intuitive way" (Nakamura, 1964, p. 195). For example, Zen Masters posed with the following question gave more than a hundred different answers: "What is the essence of Zen Buddhism?" Some said, "Today and tomorrow;" others replied, "An oak tree in the

garden;" and still others responded, "White clouds embrace rocky stones" (Nakamura, 1964, p. 194). In other words, there is no one definitive answer to any single question for it depends on the context and time in which the question was asked. Conversely, to ask ministers and priests "What is the essence of Christianity?", their replies would be far more consistent, and most would respond with "Jesus Christ." Nakamura explains the intuitive, inconsistent, and situational mode of Buddhist thinking succinctly:

> Since no semantic connection between the questions and the answers was required, the answers can be of infinite variety. The question and the answer are given in a moment. There is no sustained development such as characterizes Greek dialogue. (p. 194)

Contradictory statements are common in Buddhist writings. When Chinese Zen Buddhist Master Chao-chou was asked whether the nature of Buddha existed in dogs, he answered "yes" on one occasion and "no" on another. Nakamura explains that this apparent contradiction is based on the concrete situations that characterized each answer. "We may compare this to the different advice given by doctors to patients suffering from the same disease. There is an obvious contradiction in the theoretical sense but no contradiction in the practical sense" (p. 194).

Syllogistic Reasoning: Aristotle's syllogism has substantially impacted Western logic. It has become a formula

for developing an argument and processual, logical discourse: if A and B, then C. That is, given any situation where persuasion is the goal, if used correctly, the syllogism is assumed to successfully convince an audience. The syllogism is based on hypothetical examples that have not necessarily occurred but could occur in the future. Aristotle stated in Book II, Chapter 22 that a speaker "must argue not only from necessary truths, but from probable truths as well" (1960, p. 156). These probable truths need only make sense, they need not to have taken place. Unlike the concrete, vivid data favored by the Chinese and Japanese cultures, hypo-thetico deductive reasoning as illustrated by the syllogism is far more abstract. Such a system of reasoning makes sense of the world through preestablished postulates, hypotheses and theories. Thinking is not metaphorical or based on images from nature. This syllogistic system of reasoning used by many Western cultures views the world not as it actually is but as it might be.

Japanese negotiators who depend largely on concrete reasoning may find it difficult to comprehend the conjectural and probabilistic nature of American negotiation strategies. For example, American negotiators using reasoning characterized by a syllogistic, all-purpose formula, may seek future concessions from Japanese negotiators based on present-tense specifications. The world as perceived by Americans is future-oriented and plans for tomorrow can be drawn based on today's

criteria. But Japanese negotiators may wish to modify an agreement as the situation changes. Today's solution will not necessarily answer tomorrow's equation.

Conclusion

This paper began with two assumptions about intercultural communication research. First, we noted that much of the research focused on isolated and distinct variables. Second, we asserted that most of the research studies looked at those aspects of culture about which people could talk to us. Hence, it was our belief that many of the important cultural patterns often go unnoticed. One such pattern is the influence of world view on human behavior. Most specifically, we wanted to see how world view helps explain the international negotiation process.

It has been our position that it is best to perceive of world views as actual continua on which cultural variables may be placed. World view then becomes the determinate descriptor of the very nature of a culture. To understand how another culture makes sense of the world and, more specifically, how that culture negotiates, one needs to begin by looking at how that culture deals with the larger issues faced by all people. Such issues faced by individuals in all cultures relate to death, relationships, illness, the meaning of life, obligations, humanness, and the like. As Hall (1977) once wrote, "Beneath the clearly perceived, highly explicit surface

culture, there lies a whole other world, which when understood will ultimately radically change our view of human nature" (p. 15).

References

Adler, P. S. (1976). Beyond cultural identity: Reflections on cultural and multicultural man. In L. A. Samovar & R. E. Porter (Eds.), Intercultural communication: A reader (3rd ed., pp. 389-408). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Aristotle. (1960). The rhetoric of Aristotle (L. Cooper, Trans.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Bakewell, C. M. (1949). The philosophical roots of Western culture. In F. S. C. Northrop (Ed.), Ideological differences and world order: Studies in the philosophy and science of the world's cultures (pp. 69-89). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Fisher, G. (1980). International negotiation: A cross-cultural perspective. Chicago, IL: Intercultural Press, Inc.

Fisher, G. (1983). International negotiation: Cross-cultural perception. Humanist, 43(6), 14-18, 34.

Glenn, E. S. (1954). Semantic difficulties in international communication. Etc., 11, 163-180.

Graham, J. L., & Herberger, R. A., Jr. (1983). Negotiators abroad--Don't shoot from the hip. Harvard Business Review, 61, 160-168.

Graham, J. L., & Sano, Y. (1986). Across the negotiating table from the Japanese. International Marketing Review, 3(3), 58-71.

Greenwald, J. (1983, August 1). The negotiation waltz. Time, pp. 41-42.

Gulick, S. (1962). The East and West: A study of their psychic and cultural characteristics. Rutland, UT: Charles Tuttle.

Hall, D. L. (1984). The width of civilized experience: Comparative philosophy and the pursuit of evidence. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Hall, E. T. (1959). The silent language. Garden City, NY: Anchor Press.

Hall, E. T. (1977). Beyond culture. New York: Anchor Books.

Hofstede, G. (1980). Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Howell, W. S. (1982). The empathic communicator. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Jain, N. C. (1982). Some basic cultural patterns of India. In L. A. Samovar & R. E. Porter (Eds.), Intercultural communication: A reader (5th ed., pp. 114-120). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Morrison, J. L. (1972). The absence of a rhetorical tradition in Japanese culture. Western Speech, 36, 89-102.

Nakamura, H. (1964). Ways of thinking of Eastern peoples: India-China-Tibet-Japan. Honolulu, HI: East-West Center Press.

Nofsinger, R. E. (1986). Communication and consciousness [Special issue]. Western Journal of Speech Communication, 50(1).

Northrop, F. S. C. (1946). The meeting of East and West. New York: MacMillan Co.

Northrop, F. S. C. (Ed.). (1949). Ideological differences and world order. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Okabe, R. (1983). Cultural assumptions of East and West. In W. B. Gudykunst (Ed.), Intercultural communication theory: Current perspectives (pp. 21-44). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Oliver, R. T. (1962). Culture and communication. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

Pennington, D. L. (1985). Intercultural communication. In L. A. Samovar & R. E. Porter (Eds.), Intercultural communication: A reader (4th ed., pp. 30-39). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Porter, R. E., & Samovar, L. A. (1988). Approaching intercultural communication. In L. A. Samovar & R. E. Porter (Eds.), Intercultural communication: A reader (5th ed., pp. 15-30). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Samovar, L. A., Porter, R. E., & Jain, N. C. (1981). Understanding intercultural communication. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Stewart, E. (1972). American cultural patterns: A cross-cultural perspective. Chicago: Intercultural Network.

Stewart, E. C. (1976). American advisors overseas. In L. A. Samovar & R. E. Porter (Eds.), Intercultural communication: A reader (2nd ed., pp. 319-325). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Van Nieuwenhauijze, C. A. O. (1963). Cross-cultural studies. The Hague, Netherlands: Mouton & Co.

Weiss, S. E., & Stripp, W (1985). Negotiating with foreign businesspersons: An introduction for Americans with propositions on six cultures (Working paper No. 1.). New York: New York University, Graduate School of Business Administration.